



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

5/1
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,768	09/10/2003	Yutaka Egawa	117125	3914
7590	08/23/2006		EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. Box 19928 Alexandria, VA 22320			TRAN, TUYETLIEN T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/658,768	EGAWA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran	2179		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As to claims 6 and 7, a “computer program product” is being recited. A computer program claimed without a computer readable medium capable of producing a useful result, concrete and tangible result when used in the computer system is computer software by itself.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parasnis (Patent No 6,728,753 B1; hereinafter Parasnis) in view of Ries et al. (Pub. No US 2004/0217985 A9; hereinafter Ries).

As to independent claim 1, Parasnis teaches:

A video browsing system (e.g., online presentation broadcasting schemes, see col. 7, lines 2-3) comprising:

a distribution server (e.g., NETSHOW server 1170, see Fig. 9) configured to store and distribute content (e.g., files are sent from the local computer to the server 1170 for broadcasting, see col. 5, lines 30-35) including video data (Video content 1192, see Fig. 9) and slide data (HTML slides 1178, see Fig. 9) reproduced in synchronization with the video data (see col. 20, lines 49-65);

a browsing client (e.g., browser window 1195, see Fig. 10) configured to receive the content (e.g., data stream is received by receiving computers, see col. 4, lines 43-48), to reproduce and display (e.g., replicated and displayed, see col. 21, lines 15-22) the video data on a screen (see Fig. 10, item 1199) thereof, and to synchronously display the slide data (see col. 21, lines 11-22); and

a provider client (e.g., local computers 1152, see Fig. 9) belongs to a content provider (e.g., slides provider, see col. 4, lines 5-8) and having a permission to edit the content (see Fig. 3, option 206),

Parasnus further teaches managing a permission for editing the content (see Fig. 3, option 206) and a permission for browsing the content (see Fig. 10). However, Parasnus fails to explicitly teach that the distribution server comprises a manage unit configured to manage a permission for browsing each of a plurality of content and a permission for editing the content, and the manage unit allows to distribute the content in accordance with an access of the browsing client of a user having the permission for browsing the content, and allows to edit the content in accordance with an access of the provider client.

Ries teaches:

wherein the distribution server (e.g., web server 110, see Fig. 1) comprises a manage unit (e.g., backend application logic 124 or edit brain 202, see Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) configured to manage a permission for browsing each of a plurality of content (see [0023] lines 1-4) and a permission for editing the content (see [0059] lines 8-14), and wherein, the manage unit (e.g., backend application logic 124 or edit brain 202, see Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) allows to distribute the content (see page 908 on Fig. 9) in accordance with an access of the browsing client of a user having the permission for browsing the content (see [0022] lines 8-10), and allows to edit the content in accordance with an access of the provider client (it should be noted that editing control 906 is provided only to authorized editing clients, see [0102] lines 10-13 and Fig. 9; further note that upon selection of the editing control 906, various modifications are made to the web page and graphical controls as shown in Fig. 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the edit managing unit as taught by Ries to the video browsing system as taught by Parasnis to allow the client read/write access to the server file system and further to create security, privacy, and corruption issues as well as to maintain data integrity and business rules (see Ries [0010] and Fig. 5 box 506).

As to independent claim 4, Parasnis teaches:

A distribution server (e.g., NETSHOW server 1170, see Fig. 9) comprising:
a distribution unit configured to distribute content (e.g., the software component used in the server 1170 for broadcasting, see col. 5, lines 30-35) including video data

(Video content 1192, see Fig. 9) and slide data (HTML slides 1178, see Fig. 9)

reproduced in synchronization with the video data (see col. 20, lines 49-65); and

Parasnus further teaches managing a permission for editing the content (see Fig. 3, option 206) and a permission for browsing the content (see Fig. 10). However, Parasnus fails to explicitly teach that a manage unit configured to manage a permission for browsing each of a plurality of content and a permission for editing the content, wherein the manage unit allows to distribute the content in accordance with an access of the browsing client of a user having the permission for browsing the content, and allows to edit the content in accordance with an access of the provider client.

Ries teaches:

a manage unit (e.g., backend application logic 124 or edit brain 202, see Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) configured to manage a permission for browsing each of a plurality of content (see [0023] lines 1-4) and a permission for editing the content (see [0059] lines 8-14),

wherein the manage unit allows to distribute the content (see page 908 on Fig. 9) in accordance with an access of the browsing client of a user having the permission for browsing the content (see [0022] lines 8-10), and allows to edit the content in accordance with an access of the provider client (it should be noted that editing control 906 is provided only to authorized editing clients, see [0102] lines 10-13 and Fig. 9; further note that upon selection of the editing control 906, various modifications are made to the web page and graphical controls as shown in Fig. 10). Thus, combining

Parasnus and Ries would meet the claimed limitation for the same reason as discussed in claim 1.

As to independent claim 5, Parasnus teaches:

A manage client (e.g., local computers 1152, see Fig. 9) for managing a video browsing system (e.g., schedule broadcast, see Fig. 3) including: a distribution server (e.g., NETSHOW server 1170, see Fig. 9) configured to store and distribute content (e.g., files are sent from the local computer to the server 1170 for broadcasting, see col. 5, lines 30-35) including video data (Video content 1192, see Fig. 9) and slide data (HTML slides 1178, see Fig. 9) reproduced in synchronization with the video data (see col. 20, lines 49-65); a browsing client (e.g., browser window 1195, see Fig. 10) configured to receive the content (e.g., data stream is received by receiving computers, see col. 4, lines 43-48), to reproduce and display (e.g., replicated and displayed, see col. 21, lines 15-22) the video data on a screen (see Fig. 10, item 1199) thereof, and to synchronously display the slide data (see col. 21, lines 11-22); and a provider client (e.g., local computers 1152, see Fig. 9) belongs to a content provider (e.g., slides provider, see col. 4, lines 5-8) and having a permission for editing the content (see Fig. 3, option 206).

Parasnus further teaches managing a permission for editing the content (see Fig. 3, option 206) and a permission for browsing the content (see Fig. 10). However, Parasnus fails to explicitly teach that the manage client having a manage unit configured to configure a permission for browsing the content, wherein in accordance with an access of the browsing client of a user having the permission for browsing the content,

allows to distribute the content; and to configure a permission for editing the content, wherein in accordance with an access of the provider client having the permission for editing the content, allows to edit the content.

Ries teaches the manage client (e.g., web server 110, see Fig. 1) comprising: a manage unit (e.g., backend application logic 124 or edit brain 202, see Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) configured to configure a permission for browsing the content (see [0022] lines 6-10), wherein in accordance with an access of the browsing client (non-editing clients, see Fig. 1 item 132) of a user having the permission for browsing the content (see [0022] lines 8-10), allows to distribute the content (see page 908 on Fig. 9); and to configure a permission for editing the content (see [0059] lines 8-14), wherein in accordance with an access of the provider client having the permission for editing the content (e.g., editing clients, see Fig. 1 item 140), allows to edit the content (it should be noted that upon selection of the editing control 906, various modifications are made to the web page and graphical controls as shown in Fig. 10). Thus, combining Parasnus and Ries would meet the claimed limitation for the same reason as discussed in claim 1.

As to independent claim 6, Parasnus teaches:

A computer program product for controlling a distribution server (e.g., MICROSOFT NETSHOW server application program running on the NETSHOW server, see col. 5, lines 26-28), which distributes content (e.g., files are sent from the local computer to the server 1170 for broadcasting, see col. 5, lines 30-35) including video data (Video content 1192, see Fig. 9) and slide data (HTML slides 1178, see Fig. 9) reproduced in synchronization with the video data (see col. 20, lines 49-65) to a

browsing client (e.g., browser window 1195, see Fig. 10) that reproduces and displays (e.g., replicated and displayed, see col. 21, lines 15-22) the content on a screen (see Fig. 10).

Parasnus further teaches managing a permission for editing the content (see Fig. 3, option 206) and a permission for browsing the content (see Fig. 10). However, Parasnus fails to explicitly teach that the program product having means for managing a permission for browsing each of a plurality of content and a permission for editing the content; means for distributing the content in accordance with an access of the browsing client of a user having the permission for browsing the content; and means for allowing to edit the content in accordance with an access of the user having the permission for editing the content.

Ries teaches the program product comprising (e.g., program products running on web server 110, see Fig. 1) comprising:

means for managing (e.g., backend application logic 124, see Fig. 1) a permission for browsing each of a plurality of content (see [0023] lines 1-4) and a permission for editing the content (see [0059] lines 8-14);

means for distributing the content (e.g., ASP or JSP scripts running on the web server 110, see Fig. 1) in accordance with an access of the browsing client of a user having the permission for browsing the content (see [0022] lines 8-10); and

means for allowing to edit the content (e.g., ASP or JSP scripts running on edit mode, see Fig. 10) in accordance with an access of the user having the permission for editing the content (it should be noted that editing control 906 is provided only to

authorized editing clients, see [0102] lines 10-13 and Fig. 9; further note that upon selection of the editing control 906, various modifications are made to the web page and graphical controls as shown in Fig. 10). Thus, combining Parasnis and Ries would meet the claimed limitation for the same reason as discussed in claim 1.

As to independent claim 7, Parasnis teaches:

A computer program product for controlling a manage client (e.g., computer programs running on the local computer 1152, see Fig. 9), which manages a video browsing system (e.g., schedule broadcast, see Fig. 3) including: a distribution server (e.g., NETSHOW server 1170, see Fig. 9) configured to store and distribute content (e.g., files are sent from the local computer to the server 1170 for broadcasting, see col. 5, lines 30-35) including video data (Video content 1192, see Fig. 9) and slide data (HTML slides 1178, see Fig. 9) reproduced in synchronization with the video data (see col. 20, lines 49-65); a browsing client (e.g., browser window 1195, see Fig. 10) configured to receive the content (e.g., data stream is received by receiving computers, see col. 4, lines 43-48), to reproduce and display (e.g., replicated and displayed, see col. 21, lines 15-22) the video data on a screen (see Fig. 10, item 1199) thereof, and to synchronously display the slide data (see col. 21, lines 11-22); and a provider client (e.g., local computers 1152, see Fig. 9) belongs to a content provider (e.g., slides provider, see col. 4, lines 5-8) and having a permission to edit the content (see Fig. 3, option 206).

Parasnis further teaches managing a permission for editing the content (see Fig. 3, option 206) and a permission for browsing the content (see Fig. 10). However,

Parasnus fails to explicitly teach that the program product having means for configuring a permission for browsing, wherein in accordance with an access of the browsing client of a user having the permission for browsing the content, allows to distribute the content; and for configuring the permission for editing the content, wherein in accordance with an access of the provider having the permission for editing the content, allows to edit the content.

Ries teaches the program product comprising (e.g., program products running on web server 110, see Fig. 1) comprising:

means for configuring (e.g., backend application logic 124 or edit brain 202, see Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) a permission for browsing (see [0022] lines 6-10), wherein in accordance with an access of the browsing client (non-editing clients, see Fig. 1 item 132) of a user having the permission for browsing the content (see [0022] lines 8-10), allows to distribute the content (see page 908 on Fig. 9); and for configuring the permission for editing the content (see [0059] lines 8-14), wherein in accordance with an access of the provider (e.g., editing clients, see Fig. 1 item 140) having the permission for editing the content, allows to edit the content (it should be noted that upon selection of the editing control 906, various modifications are made to the web page and graphical controls as shown in Fig. 10). Thus, combining Parasnus and Ries would meet the claimed limitation for the same reason as discussed in claim 1.

As to independent claim 8, Parasnus teaches:

A video browsing method for a distribution server (e.g., NETSHOW server 1170, see Fig. 9) configured to store and distribute content (e.g., files are sent from the local

computer to the server 1170 for broadcasting, see col. 5, lines 30-35) including video data (Video content 1192, see Fig. 9) and slide data (HTML slides 1178, see Fig. 9) reproduced in synchronization with the video data (see col. 20, lines 49-65), the method comprising:

storing notational data (e.g., audience feedback or audience message 1212 or speakers notes, see Fig. 1 step 116, Fig. 14 and Fig. 5), which the user has entered into the browsing client in accordance with the slide data displayed on the screen (e.g., it should be noted that the speaker notes is associated with the slide data, see Fig. 5), in association with the user and the slide data (e.g., a user sends feedback relating to the slide data during broadcast, see Fig. 5); and

providing the stored notational data in accordance with a request from a user (e.g., the browsing clients can view speaker notes if the option 346 is checked, see Fig. 5).

Parasnus further teaches managing a permission for editing the content (see Fig. 3, option 206) and a permission for browsing the content (see Fig. 10). However, Parasnus fails to explicitly teach that managing, for each of the content, a permission for browsing the content and a permission for editing the content; distributing the content in accordance with an access of the browsing client of a user having the permission for browsing the content; allowing to edit the content in accordance with an access of a provider of the content having the permission for editing the content;

Ries teaches:

managing, for each of the content, (e.g., backend application logic 124 or edit brain 202, see Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) a permission for browsing the content (see [0022] lines 6-10) and a permission for editing the content (see [0059] lines 8-14);

distributing the content (see page 908 on Fig. 9) in accordance with an access of the browsing client (non-editing clients, see Fig. 1 item 132) of a user having the permission for browsing the content (see [0022] lines 8-10);

allowing to edit the content in accordance with an access of a provider of the content having the permission for editing the content (it should be noted that editing control 906 is provided only to authorized editing clients, see [0102] lines 10-13 and Fig. 9; further note that upon selection of the editing control 906, various modifications are made to the web page and graphical controls as shown in Fig. 10).

As to claim 2, Parasnus and Ries teach the limitation of claim 1 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above. Ries also teaches further comprising an administrator client having a permission of an administrator (see [0071] lines 8-12), wherein the manage unit (e.g., backend application logic 124 or edit brain 202, see Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) sets the permission for browsing and the permission for editing in accordance with an access of the administrator client (it should be noted that the administrator client not only has both permission for browsing and permission for editing, but also has permission for controlling editing access to the contents, see [0073]). Thus, combining Parasnus and Ries would meet the claimed limitation for the same reason as discussed in claim 1.

As to claim 3, Parasnis and Ries teach the limitation of claim 1 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above. Parasnis also teaches wherein the distribution server further comprises a storing unit (e.g., the users select distribution server as the location to store the broadcast, see Fig. 5 item 344) configured to store notational data (e.g., audience feedback or audience message 1212 or speakers notes, see Fig. 1 step 116, Fig. 14 and Fig. 5), which the user has entered into the browsing client in accordance with the slide data displayed on the screen (e.g., it should be noted that the speaker notes is associated with the slide data, see Fig. 5), in association with the user and the slide data (e.g., a user sends feedback relating to the slide data during broadcast, see Fig. 5), and

wherein the distribution server provides the notational data to the browsing client in accordance with a request from the browsing client of a user (e.g., the browsing clients can view speaker notes if the option 346 is checked, see Fig. 5).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Publication No. US 2002/0144283 A1 is cited to teach a system and method for distributing and managing media assets.

Patent No. 5,983,236 is cited to teach a method and apparatus for the distribution, processing, and display of combinations of audio, video, still images, and text which are represented by binary data files.

Publication No. US 2004/0032424 A1 is cited to teach a system and method for providing a graphical, development interface through which clients can develop a web-cast event, including a multi-media web-cast player.

Publication No. US 2003/0124502 A1 is cited to teach a computer method and apparatus to “digitize” and simulate the classroom lecturing.

Publication No. US 2003/0158913 A1 is cited to teach a system and method publishing transcoded media content in response to publishing service request from end users.

Patent No. 6,697,569 B1 is cited to teach a full multimedia production such as a seminar, conference, lecture in real time using multiple cameras.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-270-1033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday: 7:30 - 5:00 (every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh D. Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-7772. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

L.T
8/18/06

Lien Tran
Examiner
Art Unit 2179



CHANH D. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER